## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RONALD	CHAPMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION

DAVID VARANO, et al.,

NO. 13-2995

Respondents.

## **ORDER**

AND NOW, this 19th day of July 2023, upon consideration of Ronald Chapman's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF 1-1), Respondents' opposition (ECF 8), Chapman's Memorandum Supporting his Petition (ECF 15), the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Henry S. Perkin (ECF 18), Chapman's Objections (ECF 23, 24), Respondents' Response to the Objections (ECF 26) and Chapman's Reply (ECF 27), it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- 1. The Report and Recommendation (ECF 18) is **ADOPTED**;
- 2. Chapman's Objections to the R&R (ECF 23, 24) are **OVERRULED**;
- 3. The Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF 1-1) is **DENIED.**
- 4. No certificate of appealability shall issue;<sup>1</sup>
- 5. The Motion to Stay and Abey is **DENIED** as moot;
- 6. The Application for Leave to Amend (ECF 12) is **DENIED** as moot;
- 7. This case shall be **CLOSED** for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

<u>/s/ Gerald J. Pappert</u> GERALD J. PAPPERT, J.

Reasonable jurists would not debate the Court's disposition of petitioner's claims. See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).